

**United States District Court**  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION

WILLIAM ANDREWS, §  
TDCJ No. 2402581 §  
§  
v. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:23-CV-0871-S-BN  
§  
ROBERT JOHNSON, et al. §

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION OF  
THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

The United States Magistrate Judge made findings, conclusions, and a recommendation in this case. Objections were filed.<sup>1</sup> The District Court reviewed *de novo* those portions of the proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation to which objection was made, and reviewed the remaining proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation for plain error. Finding no error, the Court **ACCEPTS** the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge.

**SO ORDERED.**

SIGNED August 22, 2023.



\_\_\_\_\_  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff titled his filing “Objections and Amended Complaint.” However, the document neither contains an amended complaint nor seeks leave to file an amended complaint. The filing only contains objections, and those objections do not explain how the defects in Plaintiff’s initial Complaint could be cured. *See* Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation [ECF No. 7] 13 (quoting *Scott v. U.S. Bank Nat'l Ass’n*, 16 F.4th 1204, 1209 (5th Cir. 2021)).